

## Anne Fesh

---

**From:** Dorothy Gaw [dgaw@arh.org]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 10, 2000 12:37 PM  
**To:** 'access@fcc.gov'  
**Cc:** 'info@acb.org'  
**Subject:** Docket No. 99-339

I received the Urgent Alert from ACB and am glad the FCCvoted for videodescription for TV programs. My mom does not have this in our TV, but am glad we can use it as an alternate source of information. Dorothy Gaw

**Anne Fesh**

---

**From:** Vicki L. Flake [vlflake@sisna.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, November 11, 2000 9:21  
**To:** access@fcc.gov  
**Subject:** Descriptive Video

To whom it may concern,

It was with great excitement that I heard of FCC's decision to support video description as outlined in Docket No. 99-339 to allow the blind and visually impaired to access TV shows. I extend my heart felt thanks for this decision. I have long felt a huge desire to have this access. If it were not for having a family who watches TV I would never turn it on myself. There is nothing more depressing than to watch a show which ends silently and never know what actually happened. There are many things on TV which have next to no talking and are therefore, a waist of time for me to try and follow. Ever since Descriptive Videos were made available I have been a strong advocate of this specialized access. It is such a thrilling experience to watch a movie and actually know what is happening. Because of your efforts, I look forward to enjoying T.V. whether someone is there to narrate it or not. May I recommend that this access also include emergency messages as well as print information which is not verbally presented.

As a totally blind person I am in opposition to the petitioners for reconsideration of the reported order on video description. It would be a huge waist of time to start this process all over again. I believe the needed changes can be made as we go along. I once again thank the FCC for their decision and hope that this is just the first step in bringing video access to blind and visually impaired Americans.

Sincerely,

Leslie H. Gertsch

1301 W. 500 S.

Woods Cross, UT 84087

Phone: (801) 292-1156

11/13/2000

**Edwin Rumsey and Catherine Gleitz**  
**601 South Shepherd, Suite #148**  
**Houston, Texas 77019**  
**H. Ph. (713) 524 7265**  
**W. Ph. (713) 512 4921**

**FCC. Official Filings Docket NO. 99 339**

**The Federal Communications Commission**  
**445 12 TH. Street**  
**South West Washington, DC.20554**

**To: Magaile Salas Secretary of The Federal Communications Commission**

Thank You for your courageous vote on July 21, 2000 for the implementation of Audio Description on Commercial TV beginning on April 20002. At the present time Audio Description is only available on our Educational Channel 8. For a Blind person Audio Description fills in the missing elements such as facial expressions ,scenery changes as well as bridging the gaps in the story by painting pictures with verbal description. TV shows on Channel 8 that have Audio Description exclude The American Experience, Nature, Building Big and Nova as well as Master Piece Theater . I look forward in turning on my TV in April 20002 with Audio description and being able to watch prime time television special shows such as The academy Awards, Olympic Pageantry as well as other specials with Audio Description on a equal par of hearing impaired persons receiving Closed Captioning. There is no need to revisit this issue RE Audio Description since the facts for its need have been made perfectly clear.

Thank you again and hope to hear from you soon!

**Sincerely,**

*Catherine Gleitz*  
**Catherine Gleitz**

## Anne Fesh

---

**From:** michael greenway [razorbackhog@home.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 09, 2000 4:46 PM  
**To:** access@fcc.gov; info@acb.org

Dear FCC commissioners:

I would like to thank you for your courageous decision in July of 2000 to make descriptivfvideodescriptive video a requirement by April 2002. The only unfortunate thing is that it isn't sooner!!

It has come to my attention that some groups are petitioning you to reconsider your decision.

I would like to point out that there is nothing new that these groups have brought to the issue of descriptive video.

It is such an enjoyable thing to be able to watch a movie with my friends and enjoy it as they do. This is impossible to do without someone describing what is going on.

Again, thank you for your courageous decision.  
Michael Greenway

To the Commissioners of D.C.C.  
Docket No. 99-339

Dear Sirs

We the people legally blind or visually impaired are grateful for the July 21 ruling for video description of the key visual elements of TV programming as it would help those of us with great visual impairment so much. We hope the ruling stands firm.

Thank you,

D.S.

We are also opposed to petitioners for reconsideration of the reported order on Video Description.

Elaine Haberkorn  
Margylope Shappell  
Phyllis M. Minnick  
Mike Minnick  
Chris Schissel  
Jack Walsh  
Hebrew L. Macie  
Amy Hoffiges  
Brenda Hines  
Donna Baldinger  
Patricia Randall  
Bart Mueller  
Carol Jewell  
Loe Hallister  
Judy Fleming  
Beth Fleming  
Tam Waljank  
Jim Pitts  
Marge Hollister  
Kim A. Orosch

November 7, 2000  
Magalie Salas, Secretary  
The Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Dear MS. Salas:

My name is Bob Hachey and my address is 22 Grant Street Waltham, Ma 02453-4202. I am writing to you today for two reasons. Firstly I would like to thank you and the FCC commissioners for the ruling of July 21 concerning video description (Docket No. 99-339). Secondly, I strongly urge the FCC to reject the petitions for re-consideration filed by those opposed to mandatory video description.

As a totally blind person, I have enjoyed the benefits of video description. When I watch described movies with my wife, we both get more out of them. When we watch non-described movies and other television programs, I find myself asking her what happened. When she tells me, we both miss some of the event. If this event is on tape, I find myself hitting the pause button so she can tell me what's going on; I also rewind the tape so that we can find out what we missed while she was describing. If the event is not on tape, then we missed out on part of it. I especially enjoyed Titanic with video description. Video description gives me total access to movies and other television programming. Thus, I was very pleased with the FCC ruling which requires major television networks to begin providing video description in 2002.

I fervently hope that the FCC will reject the appeals to this ruling. Without video description, blind and visually impaired persons will not have equal access to television and movies. Moreover, the petitioners have not produced any new evidence as to why video description should not be required. They have trotted out the same tired arguments which the FCC rejected when making the ruling. Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,  
Bob Hachey

**Anne Fesh**

---

**From:** Doug E. Hall [fl\_halls@juno.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 31, 2000 11:48 PM  
**To:** access@fcc.gov  
**Cc:** info@acb.org  
**Subject:** Docket #99-339, in opposition to petitioners for reconsideration of the reported order on video description

Magalie Salas, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street SW  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Ms. Salas,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the petitioner's request for reconsideration of the FCC ruling on video description. I feel that movie producers, television stations and cable providers should not be given the opportunity to dodge their responsibility to provide adequate accessible information to visually impaired customers. It is my feeling that the petitioners are trying to deny full enjoyment and information to an important segment of the public by trying to delay or eliminate their responsibility.

Blind and visually impaired people want and expect equal access to the programming and information that is readily available to sighted viewers. Whether we want to understand and enjoy television shows or movies or want to know what the emergency warnings on television mean, it is only correct that the industry make this available. It seems that the purpose of the "Americans With Disabilities Act" (ADA) is to give people with disabilities equal access to programs and facilities that are readily available to non-disabled. If that is the case, why would the petitioner's request even be considered?

Thank you for your efforts.

Doug Hall, President  
Halifax Council of the Blind

Carla Hayes  
230 Robinhood Lane  
McMurray, PA 15317  
Phone: (724) 941-8184

November 6, 2000

Magalie Salas, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

RE: Docket No. 99-339

Dear Magalie Salas:

I am writing this letter to commend the FCC on its courageous July 21, 2000 ruling requiring networks to provide video description by April of 2002. I would also like to go on record opposing those who have petitioned the FCC to reconsider this historic ruling. In my opinion, these petitioners have not provided any new information which wasn't already known at the time that the FCC reached its decision. Therefore, their petitions should not even be considered.

Video description is vitally important for blind and visually impaired television viewers. It provides essential information about key visual elements which greatly enhances the TV viewing experience for blind and visually impaired people. Even more importantly, it can provide emergency weather and other information which is normally scrolled silently across the screen, making it useless to anyone who cannot read it. In such situations, video description can actually save lives.

I greatly enjoy the video description which is provided on some PBS programming and home videos, and I am really looking forward to enjoying it on network television in April, 2002 which your innovative ruling will provide. Please do not deprive me and thousands of other blind and visually impaired people of this opportunity. I implore you to let your July 21, 2000 order stand! By doing so, you will be providing a valuable service to the public. Thank you.

Sincerely,



Carla Hayes



November 6, 2000

Magalie Salas, Secretary  
The Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, D. C 20554

Re: Docket No. 99-339

Dear Magalie:

I am writing this letter in order to show my opposition to the "Petitions to Reconsider" on providing video description for television programming. I would hope that the FCC will stand firm and continue forward requiring television networks to begin providing video description of the key visual elements of television programming for the blind and visually impaired viewers by April, 2002

I am the parent of a blind teacher and a member of the American Council of the Blind and know how important video description for television programming can help a blind person to understand what is happening on the television during programs for those who cannot see.

It is my understanding that the petitioners (cable and motion picture industry associations and etc.) who have submitted this petition have not provided any new information which was not already known at the time the FCC reached its decision and issued the ruling. This is a crucial component of any petition to reconsider.

I appreciate the Commissioners of the FCC for their brave vote requiring the networks to begin providing this essential information service to people who are blind and visually impaired. I urge the FCC to not back down on their original ruling.

Sincerely,

  
Patricia W. Hayes

230 Robinhood Lane  
McMurray, PA 15317

✓ CC:  
Mr. Charles Crawford  
Am. Council of the Blind  
1155 15th St. NW. Suite 1004  
Washington, DC 20005

## Anne Fesh

---

**From:** Access Access [Access@fcc.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 31, 2000 6:09 PM  
**To:** JMHEIH@webtv.net  
**Cc:** info@acb.org  
**Subject:** Re: Opposition

thank you for your statement. We will keep a record of it.  
Disabilities Rights Office  
FCC

>>> ELLEN HEALEY <JMHEIH@webtv.net> 10/31/00 06:03PM >>>  
Re: In Opposition to Petitioners for Reconsideration of the Reported  
Order on Video Description

Docket Number: 99-339

Following is a copy of a letter sent to Magalie Salas, Secretary, The  
Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC  
20554

Dear Ms. Salas:

This letter is written to thank you for your vote requiring the networks  
to begin providing video description of the key visual elements of  
television programming for blind and visually impaired viewers by April  
2002.

Inasmuch as I am a parent of an adult visually impaired son, I am well  
aware of how important and exciting it would be for him to have an  
alternate means for knowing what is happening on television. My son has  
enjoyed video description in the past and would greatly relish being  
able to "watch" television shows by utilizing the video description to  
assist him in understanding the visual aspects of the programming.

I sincerely believe that television video description is long overdue  
and am anxiously awaiting its arriving in April 2002. I cannot fathom  
why anyone would ever wish to appeal this ruling and do not believe that  
the petitioners have provided any new information to support their  
position.

On behalf of all blind and visually impaired persons and their friends  
and families, I commend you for striving to make television more  
enjoyable by supporting television video description.

Sincerely yours,

Ellen Healey

**Anne Fesh**

---

**From:** Terri Hedgpeth [terrih@asu.edu]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 07, 2000 2:15  
**To:** 'access@fcc.gov'  
**Subject:** document No. 99-339

Dear FCC Commissioners:

I am writing to you concerning "petition for reconsideration of the reported order on video description" filed on behalf of several groups. I am in strong opposition to this petition for reconsideration. I speak on behalf of myself and the blind and visually impaired students at Arizona State University (ASU). I and these students have enjoyed tremendously watching movies with video description.

For the six years I've worked here in this position at ASU, numerous students, who are blind/visually impaired, and myself included, have expressed great frustration in not being able to go to the movies or watch made-for-TV movies with out someone who is sighted to describe what is happening. TV movies and shows are as inaccessible as a building with out ramps and automatic doors are to people in wheelchairs. Neither I nor the majority of my students belongs to the organized consumer organizations who claim to speak for the blind. Actually only 3% of those who are blind belong to such consumer organizations. Therefore, groups such as the National Federation of the Blind, who happens to be one of the petitioners, absolutely do not speak for the majority of the blind, despite the propaganda they circulate in Washington D.C.

Again, please do not undo the good you've done, allow the ruling on document No. 99-339 to stand. I am really looking forward to that day in April 2002 when I can turn on my Television and truly enjoy watching the network programming independently, as do the majority of my students here at ASU.

Please do not grant any reconsideration of the ruling you made on July 21, 2000. I feel that such a move would only serve to undermine the wisdom of your initial decision. It is my understanding that the petitioners have not provided any new information and that this is a requirement for granting a reconsideration. If this is the case, I hope their petition for reconsideration is denied.

**Sincerely,**

**Terri Hedgpeth**  
Student Support Specialist Sr.  
Disability Resources for Students  
Arizona State University  
Phone: (480) 965-1232  
Fax: (480) 965-0441

---

We owe a lot to the **Indians**, who taught us how to count, without which no worthwhile scientific discovery could have been made.

11/9/2000

--- Albert Einstein

---

Frank D. Helman  
54290 Pebblestone Lane  
Elkhart, IN 46514-4878

(219) 262-5430

e-mail: fdhelman@aol.com

Fax: (219) 266-5046

November 6, 2000

Magalie Salas, Secretary  
The Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Subject: Docket No. 99-339

Dear Secretary Salas:

I am writing to express my appreciation to the commissioners of the FCC for their courageous vote requiring the television networks to begin providing video descriptions for television programming. As a person suffering from macular degeneration and who will undoubtedly lose most vision in the future, I believe that it is very important for anyone who cannot see the screen to have a means of knowing what is happening on the television.

I am in opposition to petitioners for reconsideration of the reported order on video description. This is necessary for visually impaired persons. I am of the understanding that the petitioners have not provided any new information that the FCC has not already considered in making their decision.

Again, thank you for your enlightened decision,

Sincerely,

Frank D. Helman

## Anne Fesh

---

**From:** Wayne Hinckley [HinckleyWW@zsc.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 09, 2000 1:36 PM  
**To:** access@fcc.gov  
**Cc:** info@acb.org  
**Subject:** Opposition of Petition to Reconsider #99339

Dear Commissioners:

I was thrilled this past summer when I heard the news that the FCC Commissioners had approved the mandate for television producers and operators to provide at least a minimum amount of hours of programming with audio description of the visual aspects of what normal sighted viewers see on the screen. I feel that this recent ruling is a major step in the right direction.

I have a progressive degenerative eye disease, and over the years have had less and less interest in TV programs because there are so many visual clues that I cannot understand the story without someone telling me what I just missed. However, I do enjoy the professionally described videos that I borrow from our state library for the blind.

It will be wonderful to sit down with the family in 2002 and view a current television program without interrupting the concentration of a family member to tell me what is going on in the program. I look forward to that day.

I strongly urge you to ignore the recent petitions to reconsider ruling #99339. Those petitioners have no new information. Let the ruling stand, and you will forever be a friend to the entire blind community of the country.

Thank you for generating a new hope for the blind and visually impaired.

Wayne W. Hinckley  
709 W. 1300 S.  
Woods Cross, UT 84087  
hinckleyww@zsc.com

Robert W. Hoel  
4621 Heather Drive, Unit 324  
Roanoke, VA 24018

November 6, 2000

Magill Sales, Secretary  
The Federal Communication Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street SW.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Gentlemen:

Re: Docket #99-339

This letter is submitted in opposition to petitioners for reconsideration of the recorded order on video description.

I have been blind for ten (10) years. I personally spearheaded a fund drive that took more than two years to raise more than \$56,000 to enable local public TV to upgrade their transmitter to provide descriptive television.

Descriptive television means a great deal to me and to the millions of visually impaired Americans

**Descriptive television is a major part of the blind population's access to education and entertainment!**

Sincerely,

Capt. Robert W. Hoel, USNR Retired  
Past President of the Blue Ridge Council of the Blind

*C.C. Amer. Council of the Blind*

**Anne Fesh**

---

**From:** syh [syh@msn.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 01, 2000 2:54 PM  
**To:** acess@fcc.gov  
**Cc:** info@acb.org  
**Subject:** Video Description

The following comments are submitted in opposition to those petitioners seeking reconsideration of the reported order on Video Description issued in July by the FCC.-----DOCKET No. 99-339.

TV Video Description is extremely important for anyone who is blind or severely visually impaired. Imagine if you yourself were blind how frustrating it would be to hear voices but not able to see the action implied in those words.. I have been involved with a museum program for the past ten years to help blind and visually impaired people visualize and experience the wonderful works of the great masters. The Pictorial Descriptions (akin to Video Descriptions) used in this program are a major factor in communicating the art. By this technique we are able to help the formulation of mental images in our visitors minds. The reactions these people exhibit when they first grasp the vision we are creating through words and the increase in self confidence they acquire as a result of these mental images is a spine tingling experience for the docents conducting the tours. Frequently highly gratifying remarks are made by these vision-afflicted visitors to the effect that they "thought they would never again be able to enjoy great museum art". But on these tours they do "see" and enjoy great museum art. These people can learn to do anything and everything that sighted people can do if given the opportunity. I have seen them work on assembly lines in mass production industries-----working with dangerous equipment as well as sighted people do. It is extremely important that they not be denied the pleasures of experiencing the joy, adventures and educational opportunities that Television programs can bring by means of Video Description.

I wish to express my appreciation to the Commissioners of the FCC for their courageous vote which requires the networks to begin providing this essential service to people who are blind and visually impaired.

Most sincerely, Seymour Hoffman

11/1/2000



## Anne Fesh

---

**From:** Gail Elaine Irons [brightskies@wans.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 07, 2000 11:00 PM  
**To:** access@fcc.gov; info@acb.org  
**Subject:** Support of Descriptive Video (hard copy mailed to FCC)

Gail Elaine Irons  
3719 W. Cavalier Dr.  
Phoenix, AZ 85019-1717  
Brightskies@wans.net  
(602) H841-4201; B225-1717  
November 7, 2000

Magalie Salas, Secretary  
The Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th St., SW  
Washington, DC 20554h St., SW  
Re: Docket No. 99-339 - Comments in Opposition to Petitioners for  
Reconsideration of the reported Order on Video Description

Dear FCCCommissioners:

I was pleased to hear of your positive decision in July on descriptive video for television. Blind since age four, I am now a fifty-year-old psychologist in private practice. I rarely "watch" television without a sighted person who will fill me in on visual details. Needless to say, there are often times when no one is available to assist. Many blind/visually impaired people have no one to video describe for them. Listening to the dialogue of the typical prime time show without information on significant visuals is frustrating at best and pointless at worst. American society is so television oriented that a person who is not abreast of at least a decent sampling of current offerings can be at a disadvantage socially. ... And it's maddening to hear an announcer say, "Now here are tonight's winning lottery numbers," followed by silence (or music) while the potentially vital information is shown on the screen.

I can understand why the television, film, and cable industries are uncomfortable at the prospect of change. However, it is laughable to hear people claim that the regulations proposed would violate First Amendment Rights. The regular sound track of any program would be untouched; only the key visuals would be described - on a separate audio channel accessec only by those desiring that form of information. It seems that show creators would be pleased to have their hard work conveyed to an interested audience who otherwise misses much of their hard work.

Yes, providing audio description will incur additional costs. On the other hand, that service will maximize commercial impact on a large subgroup of potential viewers.

Audio description is working well in live theater; it seems that it would be even easier to do with shows on film or video tape.

The population that would benefit from descriptive video on television programming is far larger than the group of advocates working on the issue. There are thousands of blind children who could benefit. (Ironically, medical dvances have not lowered the overall rate of childhood blindness, since more premature babies are surviving, many suffering vision loss.) There are visually impaired teenagers, anxious as any sighted teen to spend money on products that catch their attention. There are employment-age folks who want to relax with television after work. And then there are the elderly - our aging parents, aunts, uncles, and grandparents. Many widows and widowers are inclined to keep the television on for company, to help

cope with their solitude. I wish we could get people in the television industry who are opposed to implementing video description to think seriously about the TV experiences of blind or severely vision impaired individuals - and about how they will cope when they themselves get older and vision fades. If they cooperate with the FCC's planned regulations, video description will be an option for them when the time comes.

Sincerely yours,

Gail E. Irons

cc/e-mail: FCC Disability Rights Office; American Council of the Blind

Wishing You Bright Skies,  
GailElaine

## Anne Fesh

---

**From:** Kim M Venable [rsvl@juno.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 08, 2000 5:06 PM  
**To:** access@fcc.gov  
**Cc:** info@acb.org  
**Subject:** Docket # 99-339

To: Magalie Salas, Secretary  
The Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

From: Randolph-Sheppard Vendors of Louisiana  
1808 Faith Place Suite B  
Terrytown, LA 70056-4104

Re: Opposition to petitioners for reconsideration  
of the reported order on video description.

This letter is in support of video description on our television sets. It is our organizations understanding that The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has received "Petitions to Reconsider" their rule requiring the television networks to begin providing video description. We would urge the Commission to stand firm on their recent decision in favor of descriptive video. Randolph-Sheppard Vendors of Louisiana (an organization for the blind in Louisiana) supports this decision and would like to express our sincere appreciation to the Commissioners for requiring the networks to begin providing this essential information service to people who are blind. This is a very important and valuable service for individuals who are blind and visually impaired. They will not have to rely on their family and friends to tell them what is happening on the screen.

Let me say again that our organization strongly supports the FCC for their courageous and very appropriate ruling. Please do not take away the rights of the blind to receive this much needed service for the blind.

Sincerely,  
David Jarvis, President

[illegible]

Jim Jirak  
3512 S 44 Ave  
Omaha, Nebraska 68105-3819  
E-mail: [jjirak@accessibility.net](mailto:jjirak@accessibility.net)

November 6, 2000

Dear Sirs,

Referencing docket number 99-339, concerning the recently adopted descriptive video policy set forth by the Federal Communication System, (FCC), for network television, I have been made aware of the movement to reconsider this decision. And yes, I have concerns.

First, I would like to commend the FCC for adopting the policy of descriptive video for network television programs. Just as the hearing impaired have the right to enjoy the same programs as their hearing counterparts, so to do the visually impaired have the same right to enjoy the same programs as our sighted counterparts.

I was first introduced to *Descriptive Video Service*, (DVS), at the national convention of *The American Council of the Blind*, (ACB), in 1990. I remember thinking during the audio described movie *Girl From Limber Lost*, this is going to be a reality soon. It gave me a sense of independence being able to rent videos and not relying on someone to "pick and choose" the parts of feature films they were, and were not, going to describe. *DVS* provides the element that has been missing for some time – the ability to know what's happening on the screen when there is no dialogue.

When the FCC revealed the proposed guidelines and the April 2002 target date for implementation, I was relieved that at long last the visually impaired would be able to enjoy television programs, independently, as our sighted counterparts. Now, because of the movement afoot by some concerned few special interest groups, this may not be a reality. And why? Is it perhaps

new information has been recently revealed that wasn't known prior to the mandate of video description? To my knowledge, petitioners have not provided any new information that wasn't known at the time of the ruling.

I ask that you please reject any attempt to further prevent the visually impaired from being able to enjoy network programming. If the hearing impaired can have closed captioning, then why can't we, the visually impaired, have video description?

**Anne Fesh**

---

**From:** Abbie Johnson [abbie@wavecom.net]

**Sent:** Saturday, November 04, 2000 10:33

**To:** access@fcc.gov; info@acb.org

**Subject:** Descriptive Video Service

To Whom It May Concern:

Please find enclosed a copy of a letter I have sent to Magalie Salas of the Federal Communications Commission regarding the petitions to reconsider the July 21st ruling requiring networks to begin providing descriptive video services in April 2002. I am pasting this letter below in case you are not able to open the attachment.

Sincerely,

Abbie Johnson

Abigail L. Johnson

200 Smith Street Apt. 303

Sheridan, Wyoming 82801

Email: abbie@wavecom.net

(307)674-6109

November 4, 2000

Magalie Salas, Secretary

The Federal Communications Commission

445 12th Street, SW

Washington, DC 20554

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter contains comments in opposition to petitioners for reconsideration of the reported order on video description. (Docket No. 99-339) I really appreciate the Federal Communications Commission's July 21st decision ordering networks to begin

11/6/2000

providing this essential information service to the blind and visually impaired. It is very important for people who can not see the screen to have an alternate means, such as descriptive video, of determining what is happening on the television. I am visually impaired and although I have not had access to this service in the past, I look forward to enjoying it starting in April 2002.

It is my understanding that the petitioners for reconsideration have supplied no new information that was not already available at the time of the commission's ruling. Therefore, I see no reason why this decision should be reconsidered.

Descriptive video is an extremely valuable service to people who are blind or visually impaired. It will make TV watching more enjoyable, especially for sighted companions who will no longer need to describe the action on the screen. Therefore, I hope you will not reconsider your July 21st ruling requiring all networks to provide this service.

Sincerely,

Abigail L. Johnson



**Anne Fesh**

---

**From:** EWJDI@aol.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 31, 2000 2:45  
**To:** info@acb.org  
**Subject:** Docket No.99-339

The Federal Communications Commission  
Magalie Salas, Secretary  
445 125h Street, SW  
Washington, D.C.  
No.99-339

Re:Docket

Sirs:

We applaud your ruling requiring the television networks to video describe their programs. It would be so wonderful for our visually impaired friends to be able to watch television with their friends and family and understand the action that is taking place.

We are appalled that petitioners have asked the Commission to reconsider its ruling, especially since they have not put forth any new information that was not known at the time the Federal Communications Commission made its decision. For all the above reasons, we are in opposiion to petitioners for reconsideration of the reported order on video description.

Very

Truly Yours,

**Eugene W. Johnson**

660 Scarsdale Road  
Crestwood, NY 10707-1328

10/31/2000